

APPROVED  
MINUTES  
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS  
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD  
FORT LAUDERDALE  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
OCTOBER 26, 2011 – 3:30 P.M.

**Cumulative Attendance**

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>May 2011 - April 2012</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	5	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair (a. 3:36)	P	5	0
Jessie Adderley	P	5	0
Sonya Burrows	P	4	0
Ron Centamore	P	5	0
Nate Ernest-Jones	P	4	1
Alan Gabriel (a. 4:20)	P	4	1
Mickey Hinton (a. 3:43)	P	4	1
Brice Lambrix	P	4	1
Yvonne Sanandres	P	3	2
Doug Sterner	P	4	1
Scott Strawbridge	P	2	0
John Wilkes (a. 3:43)	P	3	2
Samuel Williams	P	5	0

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

**Staff**

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA  
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA  
Robert Wojcik, CRA  
Mina Samadi, CRA  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to the City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

## **II. Approval of Minutes from September 28, 2011 Meeting**

**Motion** made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Ernest-Jones, to approve the minutes of the September 28, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Phillips arrived at 3:36 p.m.

## **Action Items**

## **III. Funding Request – Northwest Gardens III**

Chair Lucas introduced Melissa Brillhart of the Carlisle Development Group, explaining that the funding request was from both Carlisle and the Housing Authority of Fort Lauderdale. The request was originally presented at the September Board meeting, and has been revised since that time to include more detailed information.

Ms. Brillhart showed the Board a PowerPoint presentation on the project, stating that Northwest Gardens III is in the second phase of a four-phase master plan in the Northwest neighborhood. The Board has previously approved streetscape funding for Northwest Gardens I and helped facilitate the redevelopment of pocket parks along Sistrunk Boulevard. The request is now for \$253,106 rather than the original request of \$500,000. She showed the percentage of this request as related to the total investment in the development, noting that this figure is in line with previous requests made within the CRA.

There are two proposed streetscape upgrades: hardscapes, which include traffic calming devices and stamped asphalt within rights-of-way on the four interior streets of the development, and lighting fixtures. The proposed streetlights would be in keeping with improvements included in the CRA's larger Master Plan. Ms. Brillhart recalled that the CRA has previously contributed 100% of costs within rights-of-way and 50% of costs shared for elements within the property lines of the development.

She showed visuals of the proposed upgrades, noting that the crosswalk elements are 15 ft. beyond the property line in an easement. The stamped asphalt would be located in the rights-of-way in front of the development's driveways. The streetlight fixtures would be the same design used in other phases of the Northwest Garden development. Another option would provide solar lights on the interior streets and the historic design on 8 and 9 Streets. She concluded that the intent is to create a comprehensive network of streets

throughout the neighborhood. Because Carlisle's construction team is currently on-site, these improvements could be realized quickly and easily.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the lights proposed for 8 and 9 Streets are the same as the lights currently used on 6 Street. Mr. Battle said they are the historic streetlight design used on 7 Avenue and 7 Street. Ms. Brillhart added that the proposed solar lights have been tested in other locations, although this would be the first Housing Authority project in which they are used.

Mr. Centamore asked if the proposed lights would be additional fixtures. Ms. Brillhart explained that these lights would replace the standard lights that would otherwise be used for the project. The photometrics of both sets of lights would be the same, as would the number of fixtures.

Mr. Williams asked what was removed from the original \$500,000 request to bring it down to \$253,106. Ms. Brillhart said the request no longer contains a landscaping component, although there will be basic landscaping for the project.

Chair Lucas briefly summarized the request, noting that the sidewalk improvements would be consistent with past requests for streetscape monies from the Board; the enhanced light fixtures would be consistent with others found throughout the CRA. He felt the CRA should also contribute toward the milling and resurfacing of the street, as this makes the streets look more complete. He observed that he was not in favor of the solar lighting.

Mr. Battle advised that the City has an annual paving contract, but has not paved the area shown during the presentation, as it was blocked off. He stated he has spoken with the Public Works Department, which is seeking a way to pave this area and lessen the request, as normal maintenance of streets is the City's responsibility. Chair Lucas suggested that the CRA could pay for this improvement if the City cannot fund it.

He concluded that the hardscaping, or stamped asphalt, did not seem to be a necessary improvement. With cost adjustments made to eliminate hardscapes and solar lighting, this would reduce the amount to approximately \$195,980.

Mr. Centamore asked if the sidewalk improvements constituted an upgrade. Mr. Battle explained that the request was to split the cost of the sidewalks.

Mr. Williams asked to see a rendering of the basic landscaping. Ms. Brillhart explained that a rendering had not been included in the updated request, as landscaping had been removed from the proposal. She compared the basic landscaping to what is seen in the Dixie Court development.

**Motion** made by Mr. Lambrix, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve based on the breakdown [of \$195,980].

Mr. Williams asked how much of the development's total cost was carried by Carlisle and how much came from public funds. Ms. Brillhart said she did not have the exact breakdown on hand; however, she explained that Carlisle typically competes with other developers for tax credits aimed at low-income development. They then sell these tax credits to investors, who provide the bulk of the funds toward total construction costs.

Chair Lucas clarified that the \$195,980 would include the cost of milling and resurfacing. It was noted that this request has been made of the City.

**Amendment** made by Mr. Lambrix, that the milling and resurfacing be included in [\$195,980], if the City did not perform this service.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Hinton and Mr. Wilkes arrived at 3:43 p.m.

#### **IV. Funding Request – Housing Trust Group, LLC**

Nectaria Chakas, representing Housing Trust Group, LLC, explained that the \$125,000 funding request is for a local government contribution during the 2011 universal cycle of applications to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. She advised that the application cycle has been delayed, and the deadline has been set for December 6, 2011.

Ms. Chakas stated that the request could be made in the form of either a grant or a loan; the loan would be requested in the form of a 32-year non-amortized balloon loan, with a provision for forgiveness, at 0% interest.

She noted that the project, Village Place, will need to go through the site plan approval process. It is located on approximately one acre on the northwest corner of 7 Street and 4 Avenue. The parcel has been vacant for several years. The proposal is for a six-storey building with 111 units, of which 100% would be affordable housing; 80% of the units will be targeted toward tenants age 55 or older. She concluded that the request is contingent upon approval from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

Mr. Battle asked Ms. Chakas to describe the differences between the \$85,000 request included in the Board's backup materials and the \$125,000 request made today. Ms. Chakas said the developer had originally hoped to receive some impact fee waivers from the County; while these waivers may be available

later on, they cannot be relied upon for purposes of submitting the application and meeting the local government contribution. She added that this application was consistent with others that have come before the Board.

Mr. Wilkes asked if this applicant was competing with a similar application the Board had funded in September. Ms. Chakas confirmed this. Mr. Battle advised that there will be many applications in competition throughout the state, five of which are located within this CRA. Any number of these applications may be selected.

Mr. Williams asked to know how the 32-year loan discussed the previous month had been resolved. Mr. Battle said there had been no issues with the City Attorney's Office in terms of writing this agreement, which states if the CRA's term has been completed, the City would take over the obligation.

Mr. Wilkes asked if there are any subsequent conditions that would render the debt unforgivable. Ms. Chakas said there would be a condition stating the development must be for affordable housing. She noted that this stipulation may already accompany the land use restrictions. Mr. Battle said the City would request a restricted covenant on the use of the site.

Mr. Wilkes requested that this condition be emphasized in the event that the request is approved. Mr. Battle said if the application is funded, the CRA would be asked to approve the subsequent agreement as well. The CRA's funding would be contingent upon the development's being funded in the current application cycle.

Mr. Wilkes asked to know the timeline in which the Board could expect to learn if the application to the state was successful. Sean Wilson of the Housing Trust Group explained that they might have an idea of whether or not the application was selected in February or March. Mr. Wilkes asked if there would be additional requests for funds for the project if it is approved. Mr. Wilson said there would be no further requests.

Ms. Chakas asked if any motion made could also encompass the possibility of a grant, in case the CRA Board would prefer a grant to a loan.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Hinton, to approve granting of the \$125,000 loan or grant as may be within the Board's purview legally to provide, to this Village Place project, provided it's going to be constructed by the principals who are presenting before the Board today, subject to their being approved for the project, and conditioned upon the Board knowing that these funds will be committed on or before June 30, 2012, and that there be no

additional requests for funding for this project from the CRA. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Gabriel arrived at 4:20 p.m.

## **Discussion Items**

### **V. Disposal of City-owned Properties in NPF CRA**

Mr. Battle explained that the Mayor was concerned with the number of City-owned properties on the tax rolls, and had asked that these properties be disposed of. It was subsequently discovered that many of the lots were targeted for use by the Housing and Community Development Division, or were located within the CRA and owned by the City or its holding entities.

There are three such properties before the Board today. Mr. Battle said he had reached out to property owners within the area to determine whether or not they are interested in purchasing the lots; he stated he would also offer the Board advice on the process in terms of how the City might dispose of these properties, such as purchase of the lots by the CRA for later disposal, or development of a different disposal process. There are approximately 40 additional properties that he will bring before the Board in the future for feedback.

Most of the lots are too narrow to build on, which would mean it would be best for the adjacent property owner to purchase them. Other lots are residentially zoned and have been used for the infill housing program as buyers qualify.

Mr. Battle advised that two of the three properties before the Board today are on 22 Road, including some adjacent parcels; the third is on 6 Street. He explained that the most interested party regarding the 22 Road parcels would be the daughters of Dr. Calvin Shirley, who owned a neighborhood practice. One of the daughters, also a physician, is interested in opening a family clinic in the area, but has been reluctant to do so due to the lack of parking. Mr. Battle noted that the vacant lots could be used for this purpose. He recommended that the CRA might purchase this property from the City and work out an agreement with Dr. Shirley for its use.

The next property, also on 22 Road, is a vacant lot located behind a convenience store. Mr. Battle stated the CRA has no interest in this property and would not mind if it is surplus. The owner of the convenience store, as well as the owner of nearby apartments, has expressed interest in this property. He cautioned that the property could be purchased by a buyer who is not interested in helping further the plans of the CRA.

Mr. Williams said he was reluctant to see more property in the community go to a buyer who has shown no interest in improving the area. Mr. Strawbridge observed that it would be difficult to build a house or a commercial structure on the property; however, he expressed concern that if the property is not sold, it should at least be landscaped, as otherwise it would appear as blighted.

Mr. Sterner asked what the CRA would do if it acquired the property in order to keep it from "falling into the wrong hands." Mr. Battle said this was the key question: they could approach the adjacent owners to ask if they were interested in purchasing it, or they could hold onto the property and try to maintain it, although he pointed out that the latter is not the CRA's business.

Ms. Burrows asked if the City might be interested in creating a community garden on the property. Mr. Battle said this has been discussed, but noted that one difficulty in this case is that the garden would need to be maintained on a daily basis. Mr. Strawbridge advised that in his experience, an urban garden creates defensible space, and surrounding residents can come to care strongly about these areas. He stated that positive activity on a micro-lot such as this one will displace any negative activity that may be going on nearby.

Mr. Wilkes said he was an advocate of both park lands and urban gardening, and he felt potential public space should not be given away lightly. He pointed out that there would not be a blanket philosophy applied to all the parcels, but all should be ruled upon individually. He also felt the community should be made aware of these lots, as a neighborhood civic association might be interested in adopting a parcel for park space.

Mr. Battle suggested that the Board could discuss three to five properties at each meeting. He agreed that some properties might be easily disposed of, while others face more obstacles; it is also possible that some properties may not have potential purchasers. An action plan could be assigned to each property or set of properties, and the Board could communicate this action plan to the City Commission each month.

Mr. Gabriel advised that there could be an opportunity for land swaps, and noted that a map of the properties could be useful in determining this. Mr. Battle agreed, stating that the City does not know who owns all the adjacent properties.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if the Board might be interested in visiting some of the properties to get a better perspective on them. Mr. Battle agreed that a tour of properties could be scheduled for a future meeting if the members wished.

Mr. Battle moved on to the final property, stating that his recommendation is for the CRA to purchase this property in order to control its outcome and work with

the adjacent property owners. Purchase by the CRA would also allow the property to be sold at below fair market value, while the City's process would dictate that an appraisal must be done to determine a minimum starting price. He noted that the corners in this location are owned by other parties.

Chair Lucas concluded that the Board would like to see the whole inventory of surplus sites in order to develop an action plan, with a possible tour planned for a future meeting.

#### **VI. Prioritization of NPF CRA Implementation Plan Goals, Key Development Initiatives, and Immediate Term Tasks**

Mr. Battle recalled that at the Board's recent workshop with the City Commission, the Mayor had expressed a desire to have the Board list their tasks in a way that would help show their priorities. He stated he had listed the immediate-term tasks from the market report, development goals from the implementation plan, and key development initiatives into a document. These are restated by priority by combining the verbiage from the immediate-term tasks and development goals, as some of these actions are the same. He advised that the Board determine if they were comfortable with this approach or wished to re-prioritize some of the goals differently, and communicate their plans for the next 12 months to the CRA Board.

Mr. Sterner said he found the document to be very helpful, and noted that one ranked project, the 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> connector, may need to be moved to a higher priority if the Board wishes to emphasize its importance to the redevelopment of the northwest area.

Mr. Gabriel observed if the zoning is changed to make development more feasible for items #1-2, this could allow for development to be pursued more aggressively. He suggested they could look at the zoning of the surrounding area to determine what should be done in relation to the changes the Board would like to see. Mr. Battle said he felt the best plan in this case was to bring in a third party to help review zoning.

Mr. Battle advised that a parking consultant is completing a study at present, and it will eventually come back to the Board and the CRA Board so an Ordinance Amendment can be crafted. He said the issue of zoning is bigger than this single corridor; however, some short-term relief is needed in order to encourage changes and allow for development.

Mr. Williams noted that it is difficult to make zoning regulations from the rest of the City work properly within the CRA due to limited space and positioning of lots, and felt this could lead to the development of two sets of zoning regulations, one



for the CRA and one for the rest of the City. Mr. Lambrix observed that an overlay district can be crafted once the parking study is complete: if a certain pattern of qualities or amenities are recognized in a particular area, different regulations can be overlaid onto the ULDR Code in that area.

Mr. Strawbridge asked what parts of the zoning Code might be inhibiting development. Mr. Battle said while parking is the issue that generates the most complaints, particularly from a business standpoint, other concerns include buffering and "obnoxious uses." This includes site plan layouts when commercial and residential properties abut one another, as many lots are not very large. There is also a strong desire to limit or eliminate certain types of uses that could come into the neighborhood. He recalled previous discussions with regard to an abundance of pawnshops and liquor stores in the area.

The Board members discussed the ranking of priorities, determining that item #4 would be replaced by item #6. Mr. Wilkes said if the connector is not built, the remaining priorities might never be realized.

#### **VII. Communication to CRA Board**

None.

#### **VIII. Old / New Business**

Chair Lucas advised that while the Board regularly meets on the fourth Wednesday of each month, the meeting will be moved to November 16 in order to avoid potential conflict with the Thanksgiving holiday. He added that Mr. Hubert has resigned from the Board, which means there is an opening for an appointment from Commissioner Rogers.

Mr. Battle stated there may be a presentation from a Homeless Assistance Center at the November 16 meeting. He recalled that the proposed expansion of this facility had been discussed at the recent City Commission Conference Agenda meeting. This is a capital project located within the CRA.

Ms. Chakas asked if another funding request might be made into a walk-on item if the Board agreed to it. She explained that this request was affected by the December 6 application deadline discussed earlier. The Board agreed to hear the request.

Ms. Chakas introduced Doug Mayer of Global Development Initiatives, stating that the application in this case is for the Andrews Village Apartments Ltd. The property has received all necessary approvals from the City Commission. It was originally approved as a condominium in 2009. The request is for a \$125,000

local contribution in the form of a grant or a loan, with the same loan terms as previously stated: a 32-year non-amortized balloon loan at 0% interest with a provision for forgiveness at the end of the term. The grant or loan would again be contingent upon the application receiving an award from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. The project is a 12-storey, 106-unit mixed-income development. Some units will be market-rate and others will be affordable housing.

Mr. Williams asked that any **motion** made in support of the project use the same wording as his previous **motion**.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Strawbridge, to approve granting of the \$125,000 loan or grant as may be within the Board's purview legally to provide, to this Village Place project, provided it's going to be constructed by the principals who are presenting before the Board today, subject to their being approved for the project, and conditioned upon the Board knowing that these funds will be committed on or before June 30, 2012, and that there be no additional requests for funding for this project from the CRA.

Mr. Wilkes noted that the Board had just received the information package for this project, and advised that because they are approving the funding request, they are not necessarily approving the project. He asked that it be brought back before the Board in the event it is changed or modified. Ms. Chakas agreed with this condition.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Willie McNair, president of Deangelo Development, and Robert McNair, vice president, informed the Board that they will appear at the November 16 meeting to discuss a funding request for some townhouses and single-family homes in Progresso Village and the Dorsey Riverbend neighborhood. Mr. Battle advised that they have made previous funding requests approved by the Board. Their presentation would show the impact their previous projects have made in stabilizing the community over the last 10 years. He noted that they own some property next to one of the City's surplus lots and are a prospective purchaser of that lot.

## **IX. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.